

REMARKS

A review of the claims indicates that:

- A) Claim 1 is currently amended.
- B) Claims 2, 3, 5—11 and 13—29 remain in their original form.
- C) Claims 4 and 12 currently cancelled.

In view of the following remarks, Applicant respectfully requests reconsideration of the rejected claims and withdrawal of the rejections.

35 U.S.C. §102 Rejections

Claims 1—5, 9—16, 20—22, 26, 28 and 29 were rejected under §102(e) as being anticipated by U.S. Patent No. 20020013910, hereinafter “Edery.” In response, the Applicant submits that the Office has failed to establish a *prima facie* case of anticipation and, in view of the comments below, respectfully traverses the Office’s rejections.

Claim 1 recites a processor-readable medium comprising processor-executable instructions for:

- parsing an input file to recognize a file format of the input file, wherein the parsing repeatedly parses with a plurality of component parsers contained within an extensible parser, wherein the extensible parser is a compound parser and each of the plurality of component parsers is configured for recognition of a specific file format;
- checking contents of the input file, according to the recognized file format, to determine whether executable code exists within the input file;
- continuing to parse the input file with all remaining component parsers after at least one component parser recognizes the file format of the input file; and
- sending a status in response to results of said checking.

1 Claim 1 has been amended to recite the elements of Claims 4, 11 and 12,
2 and therefore retains the scope of these combined claims. As amended, Claim 1
3 recites in part, "parsing an input file to recognize a file format of the input file,
4 wherein the parsing repeatedly parses with a plurality of component parsers
5 contained within an extensible parser".

6 The Applicant submits, *inter alia*, that Edery does not recognize a file's
7 format using component parsers contained in an extensible parser. The Applicant
8 further submits that, at most, Edery discloses components 551, 552 that are
9 configured to detect *file content*, not to *recognize a file format*.

10 Referring to Fig. 5, [0086] and [0087] of the Edery reference, Edery
11 discloses that a file type detector 503 determines whether a file is, or includes, an
12 executable file type (see [0086] first 3 lines). Referring to Fig. 5, Edery does *not*
13 disclose that detector 503 includes a plurality of component parsers within an
14 extensible parser, as recited by Claim 1. The detector is configured to analyze the
15 file header (see [0086] next 7 lines). Edery discloses that the headers of
16 compressed files, such as zipped files, can also be examined, to determine if
17 executable code and/or file types are included ([0086] next several lines).
18 Additionally, the detector examines file delimiters such as ".exe" to determine if
19 executable code is present.

20 Accordingly, Edery discloses that the file type detector 503 detects files
21 that have, or likely have, executable code ([0086], first several lines). However,
22 Edery's file type detector 503 is not configured to repeatedly parse with a plurality
23 of component parsers contained within an extensible parser. The use of
24 component parsers to recognize a file format is not disclosed by Edery.
25

Referring to paragraph [0092] and Fig. 5 of the Edery reference, Edery discloses a content detector 505, configured to provide one or more content analyses, such as distinguishing binary data, pattern data and other data. For example, the content may be analyzed for binary information ([0092] at line 6) by binary detector 551. Additionally, the content may be analyzed for pattern detection by pattern detector 552 ([0092] at line 7).

Thus, Edery discloses a content detector that includes plural elements. However, a disclosure of "content analysis" does not anticipate a recitation of "file format recognition". Edery performs file format recognition at 503, thereby showing that "content analysis" is distinct from "file format recognition." The Applicant has recited, "parsing an input file *to recognize a file format* of the input file, wherein the parsing, the input file repeatedly parses with *a plurality of component parsers* contained within an extensible parser" (emphasis added). The recitation by Claim 1 of components *to recognize a file format* is not anticipated by the Edery disclosure of *a content detector* having two or more component parts. That is, the Applicant recites, "recognizing a file format" while Edery discloses, "content detection". The Applicant respectfully submits that, for at least this reason, that Edery does not fairly anticipate the Applicant's claim.

Notwithstanding the above remarks, the Patent Office suggests that Edery discloses component parsers within an extensible parser (see Office Action mailed 06/29/2007, page 3, rejection of Claim 4 (now incorporated by amendment into Claim 1)). In particular, the Patent Office points to Edery at [0086], [0087] and [0092] and suggests that Edery discloses component parsers contained within an extensible parser to recognize file format. The Applicant respectfully disagrees.

As noted above, Edery's content detector 505 includes components 551 and 552. However, the content detector does not determine a data file format. Recall that a file format is a type of file, such as "jpeg", "PDF" and "doc". Each file format, such as the Microsoft Word "doc" format, has specific conventions regarding data storage. Instead, Edery specifically discloses that the detectors 551 and 552 detect binary data and pattern data, respectively (see [0092]). Therefore, while Edery's detector 505 detects binary data and/or data patterns, it does not recognize file format. Instead, Edery recognizes file format at 503 (Fig. 5).

Claim 1 has also been amended to recite the elements of Claims 11 and 12, and recites, "continuing to parse the input file with all remaining component parsers after at least one component parser recognizes the file format of the input file". As discussed in the Examiner interview, the Edery reference does not show or disclose such continued parsing, as recited, wherein the parsing is based on recognizing file formats.

In rejecting Claims 11 and 12 (now incorporated in Claim 1) the Patent Office pointed to Edery at paragraphs [0092] and [0093].

However, a review of Edery, generally and at these locations, does not reveal a disclosure of the use of an extensible and compound parser organized so that each component parser is associated with a particular file type (e.g. a DWG file type). Instead, Edery discloses the use of "binary" and "pattern" "detectors" wherein each detector is not associated with recognition of an individual file type. Accordingly, Edery does not disclose the compound parser as recited, having component parsers associated with individual file types.

Accordingly, the Applicant respectfully submits that the Edery reference does not fairly support a Section 102 rejection, and respectfully requests that the Section 102 rejection be removed.

Claims 2, 3 and 5—13 depend from Claim 1 and are allowable due to their dependence from an allowable base claim. These claims are also allowable for their own recited features that, in combination with those recited in Claim 1, are not shown and not disclosed in references of record, either singly or in combination with one another.

Claim 14 recites a method of detecting code-free files, comprising:

- parsing an input file with a compound parser configured to include a plurality of component parsers, **wherein each component parser is configured to recognize a specific data file format;**
- analyzing contents of the input file according to the recognized specific file format, where available, to determine if the input file contains executable code; and
- sending a status in response to results of said analyzing.

Claim 14 is in original and un-amended format. Claim 14 recites, “wherein each component parser is configured to recognize a specific data file format”. The Applicant respectfully submits that the Edery reference does not disclose a component parser configured to recognize a specific data file format.

The Applicant notes that Edery discloses a file type detector 503 (see Fig. 5 and [0086] wherein the file type detector is erroneously labeled “502”). The file type detector determines the “type” of the file, such as a “.exe” file. However, the file detector does not comprise “component parsers”. The file type detector 503 is “monolithic” in structure, in that it does not include “components,” as recited by Claim 14. Additional aspects of the file type detector 503 are discussed at [0087].

1 However, no component parsers, each associated with a specific data file format
2 are disclosed.

3 The Patent Office points to Ederly at [0086] and [0087]. The Applicant
4 respectfully disagrees that [0086] and [0087] of Ederly disclose the elements
5 recited by Claim 14.

6 Referring to Ederly at these locations, a file type detector 503 is configured
7 to detect file formats such as the ".exe" file format of an executable file.
8 However, Ederly's file type detector 503 is not configured to include component
9 parsers. The file type detector 503 appears to be monolithic in structure. Nothing
10 in the text of [0086], [0087] or in Fig. 5 of Ederly discloses, "each component
11 parser is configured to recognize a specific data file format", as recited by Claim
12 14.

13 Therefore, the Applicant respectfully submits that Ederly does not disclose a
14 compound parser configured recognize a specific data file format. Instead, Ederly
15 discloses a file type detector 503 that is not compound in nature, and does not
16 comprise component parsers configured to recognize a specific data file format.
17 Accordingly, the Applicant respectfully requests that the Section 102 rejection be
18 removed.

19 Claims 15—20 depend from Claim 14 and are allowable due to their
20 dependence from an allowable base claim. These claims are also allowable for
21 their own recited features that, in combination with those recited in Claim 14, are
22 not shown and not disclosed in references of record, either singly or in
23 combination with one another.
24
25

1 **Claim 21** recites an apparatus for detecting code-free files, comprising:

- 2 • a compound parser configured to repeatedly parse an input file,
3 wherein each component parser within the compound parser is
4 configured to recognize executable code within a specific file format
5 selected from among a group of data file formats; and
- 6 • **a controller to examine success of each of the component parsers
7 to recognize the specific file format for which it was configured
8 to recognize** and to find executable code within the input file,
9 wherein the controller is configured to send a status in response to
10 results of said checking.

11 Claim 21 is in original and un-amended format. The Applicant
12 incorporates the remarks with respect to Claim 14, above, at this location by
13 reference, and provides the below additional remarks.

14 Claim 21 recites, “a controller to examine success of each of the component
15 parsers to recognize the specific file format for which it was configured to
16 recognize”. The Applicant respectfully submits that the Edery reference does not
17 disclose component parsers configured to recognize specific file formats.

18 The Applicant notes that Edery discloses a file type detector 503 (see Fig. 5
19 and [0086] wherein the file type detector is erroneously labeled “502”). The file
20 type detector determines the “type” of the file, such as “.exe”. However, the file
21 detector does not comprise “component parsers”. The file type detector 503 is
22 “monolithic” in structure, in that it does not include “components,” as recited by
23 Claim 14.

24 The Patent Office points to [0086] and [0087] of Edery’s application. At
25 these locations, Edery discloses a file type detector 503 configured to detect file
formats such as the “.exe” file format of an executable file. However, Edery’s file
type detector 503 is not configured to include component parsers. It appears to be
monolithic in structure. Referring to Fig. 5, the structure of the file type detector

1 does not indicate any component parsers to recognize specific file formats, as
2 disclosed.

3 Therefore, the Applicant respectfully submits that Edery does not disclose a
4 compound parser configured recognize a specific data file format. Instead, Edery
5 discloses a file type detector 503 that is not compound in nature, and does not
6 comprise component parsers configured to recognize a specific data file format.
7 Accordingly, the Applicant respectfully requests that the Section 102 rejection be
8 removed.

9 **Claims 22—29** depend from Claim 21 and are allowable due to their
10 dependence from an allowable base claim. These claims are also allowable for
11 their own recited features that, in combination with those recited in Claim 21, are
12 not shown and not disclosed in references of record, either singly or in
13 combination with one another.

14 **Claim 3** recites The processor-readable medium as recited in claim 1,
15 additionally comprising further instructions for **sending a don't-know status**
16 **when the file format of the input file was not recognized.**

17 Claim 3 recites, “sending a don't-know status when the file format of the
18 input file was not recognized”. The Applicant respectfully submits that Edery
19 does not disclose a “don't know” status indicating that an input file format was not
20 recognized.

21 The Patent Office points to Edery at paragraph [0088], suggesting that a
22 “don't know” status is sent when a format of an input file is not recognized. The
23 Applicant respectfully disagrees.
24
25

1 Referring to Edery at [0088], the first two sentences (first 7 lines) discuss
2 file inflation (i.e. decompressing a file). Referring to Fig. 5, the file inflator 504 is
3 configured to de-compress a file.

4 The third sentence, lines 7—11 of [0088], discuss that a compressed meta
5 file may include nested file type information not otherwise reliably provided in an
6 overall file header. In such circumstances, the file inflator 504 returns that
7 information to the parser 502.

8 In the fourth and final sentence in Edery's paragraph [0088], Edery
9 discloses that the file inflator 504 also provides executable files to the control
10 block 506, where they may be packaged with an MPC or policies.

11 Therefore, the Applicant submits that a careful review of Edery's paragraph
12 [0088] indicates no disclosure of "sending a don't-know status when the file
13 format of the input file was not recognized". In fact, Edery does not address
14 failure to recognize a file format of an input file. Accordingly, Edery does not
15 address sending a "don't know" status.

16 In view of the above, the Applicant respectfully requests that the Section
17 102 rejection be removed.

18 **Claims 16 and 22** are allowable for substantially the same reasons that
19 Claim 3 is allowable, and the Applicant would like to incorporate the remarks with
20 respect to Claim 3 in addressing the rejections of Claims 16 and 22.

21
22 **Claim 12** recites, the processor-readable medium as recited in claim 11,
23 additionally comprising further instructions for **continuing to parse the input file**
24 **with all remaining component parsers after at least one component parser**
25 **recognizes the file format of the input.**

1 Claim 12 recites, "continuing to parse the input file with all remaining
2 component parsers after at least one component parser recognizes the file format
3 of the input". The Applicant respectfully submits that Ederly does not disclose a
4 continuation of parsing after file recognition, and asks that the Section 102
5 rejection be withdrawn.

6 The Patent Office suggests that Ederly discloses the recited elements at
7 paragraph [0092]. The Applicant respectfully disagrees.

8 Referring to Ederly at paragraph [0092], Ederly discloses content analysis
9 ([0092] at line 1) and not file format detection (Ederly does that at 503). At [0092],
10 lines 1—3, Ederly discloses content analysis using the content detector 505. At
11 [0092], lines 4—9, Ederly discloses that content analysis can include binary
12 detection (using detector 551) and/or pattern detection (using detector 552). At
13 lines 9—14, Ederly discloses analysis of the results of the content analysis. The
14 balance of paragraph [10092] discusses analysis of the results of the content
15 evaluation.

16 The Applicant respectfully points out that Ederly is not, in [0092],
17 discussing recognition of file format, which is recited by Claim 12. Instead, Ederly
18 is discussing content analysis. Ederly discloses recognition of file format at [0086]
19 and [0087], where file type detector 503 is disclosed. Note that Ederly calls the file
20 type detector "502" in these paragraphs. However, even in [0086] and [0087],
21 Ederly does not disclose using all component parsers, even after one component
22 has recognized the file. This partly true because Ederly does not disclose
23 continuing the effort after the file has been detected, and partly because Ederly
24 does not disclose component parsers adapted for file type recognition.
25

1 In view of these deficiencies in the Edery reference, the Applicant
2 respectfully requests that the Section 102 rejection of Claim 12 be removed.

3
4 **Claim 29** recites, the apparatus as recited in claim 21, wherein the
5 **compound parser is configured to allow extension by addition of a new**
6 **component parser to the compound parser, wherein the new component**
7 **parser recognizes a further file format and recognizes executable code within**
8 **the further file format.**

9 Claim 29 recites, “wherein the compound parser is configured to allow
10 extension by addition of a new component parser to the compound parser, wherein
11 the new component parser recognizes a further file format and recognizes
12 executable code within the further file format”. The Applicant respectfully
13 submits that Edery does not disclose an extension to a compound parser, and asks
14 that the Section 102 rejection be withdrawn.

15 The Patent Office suggests that Edery discloses the recited elements at
16 paragraph [0093]. The Applicant respectfully disagrees.

17 Referring to Edery at paragraph [0093], Edery discloses “parameters”. In
18 [0094], we see that the parameters can be “use” parameters or “executable”
19 parameters. However, Edery does not disclose that the parameters allow
20 recognition of a further file format and recognizes executable code within the
21 further file format. In fact, the disclosure by Edery at [0093] does not appear to be
22 analogous to the recited claim material.

23 In view of these deficiencies in the Edery reference, the Applicant
24 respectfully requests that the Section 102 rejection of Claim 29 be removed.
25

Conclusion

The Applicant submits that all of the claims are in condition for allowance and respectfully requests that a Notice of Allowability be issued. If the Office's next anticipated action is not the issuance of a Notice of Allowability, the Applicant respectfully requests that the undersigned attorney be contacted for the purpose of scheduling an interview.

Also, the Applicant would like to thank the Examiner for taking time to discuss the claims and prior art on 11 December 2007, and would very much welcome the opportunity to discuss the same and similar issues again, if needed, to resolve this application.

Respectfully Submitted;

Dated: 12-31-07

By: 

David S. Thompson
Reg. No. 37,954
Attorney for Applicant

LEE & HAYES PLLC
Suite 500
421 W. Riverside Avenue
Spokane, Washington 99201

Telephone: 509-324-9256 x235
Facsimile: (509) 323-8979